

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION:

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 3-5, 19, and 21 have been canceled, and claim 20 has been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 6-18, and 20 are pending and under consideration.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

In the Office Action, at page 2 item 2, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6-8, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Formoso (U.S. 2,811,405 – hereinafter Formoso). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. Applicants traverse this rejection and respectfully request reconsideration.

In the Office Action, at page 2, item 3, the Examiner rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Fink et al., (US 3,153,918 – hereinafter Fink). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. Applicants traverse this rejection and respectfully request reconsideration.

Claim 21 has been cancelled.

Independent claim 1 recites: "...a cabinet having a storage compartment therein; a first door to open and close a first side of the storage compartment; and a second door to open and close a second side of the storage compartment."

Independent claim 6 recites: "...a cabinet having at least one refrigerated compartment with first and second openings; a first door selectively opening and closing the first opening of the refrigerated compartment; and a second door selectively opening and closing the second opening of the refrigerated compartment."

And independent claim 12 recites: "...a cabinet having a plurality of refrigerated compartments, each compartment having a first door selectively opening and closing a first opening thereof, and a separate temperature control, wherein at least one of the plurality of refrigerated compartments has a second door selectively opening and closing a second opening thereof."

"Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference the disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim." Lindemann

Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoise and Derrick Co., 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir 1984).

Formoso discloses a refrigerator apparatus, rotatably mounted on a base 10, and having a pair of chambers, namely, a freezing chamber and a refrigerating chamber, separated by a partition 24. Each chamber has a single opening covered by one of doors 25 or 26. (See Formoso, at FIGS. 2 and 5, and col. 2, lines 3-10).

In contrast, the claimed invention recites a first door to open and close a first side of a storage compartment; and a second door to open and close a second side of the storage compartment.

Applicants respectfully submit that Formoso neither discloses nor suggests each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 6, and 12 patentably distinguish over the cited art, and should be allowable for at least the above-mentioned reasons. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 7-11, and 13-16, which depends from one of independent claims 1, 6, or 12, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 6, and 12, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

In the Office Action, at page 2, item 5, the Examiner rejected claims 3-5, 9-11, and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Formoso in view of Hull (U.S. Patent No. 2,161,297 – hereinafter Hull). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. Applicants traverse this rejection and respectfully request reconsideration.

Claims 3-5, and 19 have been cancelled. Claim 20 has been rewritten in independent form.

Independent claim 17 recites: "...a cabinet having at least one refrigerated compartment with first and second openings; a first door selectively opening and closing the first opening of the refrigerated compartment; a second door selectively opening and closing the second opening of the refrigerated compartment..."

And amended, independent claim 20 recites: "...a first door selectively opening and closing a first opening of the at least one compartment, positioned on a first face of the container; and a second door selectively opening and closing a second opening of the at least

one compartment, positioned on a second face of the container, wherein the second face is opposite to the first face."

The Examiner asserts that Formoso discloses the claimed invention except for the slidable table placed on top of the cabinet. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As a general matter, to establish a prima facie obviousness rejection, the Examiner needs to provide both the existence of individual elements corresponding to the recited limitations, and a motivation to combine the individual elements to create the recited invention. (See MPEP, at 2143.03, and 2143.01). Should the Examiner fail to provide evidence that the individual elements exist in the prior art, or that the motivation exists in the prior art or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, then the Examiner has not provided sufficient evidence to maintain a prima facie obviousness rejection of the claim. (See MPEP, at 2143.03, and 2143.01).

As noted in the section regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102, Formoso discloses a refrigerator apparatus, rotatably mounted on a base 10, and having a pair of chambers, namely, a freezing chamber and a refrigerating chamber, separated by a partition 24. Each chamber has a single opening covered by one of doors 25 or 26. (See Formoso, at FIGS. 2 and 5, and col. 2, lines 3-10).

Applicants respectfully submit that Formoso neither discloses nor suggests a first door selectively opening and closing a first opening of the at least one compartment, positioned on a first face of the container; and a second door selectively opening and closing a second opening of the at least one compartment, positioned on a second face of the container.

Accordingly, Formoso cannot disclose or suggest that the first and second openings of the at least one compartment are opposite to each other.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Hull fails to cure these defects.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to provide evidence that the individual elements exist in the combination of Formoso and Hull, and thus, the Examiner has not provided sufficient evidence to maintain a prima facie obviousness rejection of the claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 17 and 20 patentably distinguish over the cited art, and should be allowable for at least the above-mentioned reasons. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 18, which depends from independent claim 17, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 17, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the cited art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 24 AUG 2005

By: Michael A. Bush
Michael A. Bush
Registration No. 48,893

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501